

**Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG)  
DOE Transportation Protocols Topic Group  
Third Meeting, February 16, 2000, Las Vegas, Nevada**

**Topic Group Notes and Action Items**

The third meeting of the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) DOE Transportation Protocols Topic Group was held at the Circus Circus Hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada on February 16, 2000. Participants included: **Mona Williams**, DOE/National Transportation Program (NTP); **Alex Thrower**, Urban Energy & Transportation Corporation (UETC); **Robert Fronczak**, Association of American Railroads (AAR); **Richard Swedberg**, DOT/Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA); **Kevin Blackwell**, DOT/Federal Railroad Administration (FRA); **Audrey Eidelman**, Energy Communities Alliance (ECA); **Ken Niles**, Oregon Office of Energy/Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB); **Lisa Sattler**, Council of State Governments-Midwest Office (CSG-MW); **Robert Alcock**, DOE/Office of Environmental Management (EM); **Jim Carlson**, DOE/Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management; **Dennis Bechtel**, Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) Transportation Committee; **Rex Massey**, Lander/Churchill Counties (NV); **Ray English**, DOE/Nuclear Naval Propulsion Program; **Elmer Naples**, DOE/Nuclear Naval Propulsion Program; **Sandra Threatt**, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control; **Bill Mackie**, New Mexico Radioactive Waste Task Force; **Ron Ross**, EMAB Transportation Committee/Western Governors' Association (WGA); **Phillip Paull**, Council of State Governments-Northeastern Conference (CSG-NE); **Michael Conroy**, MACTEC, Inc. (Writing Group support); **Carl Guidice**, DOE/EM; **Carol Hanlon**, DOE/Office of Security and Emergency Operations (SO); and **Albert Dietz**, DOE/SO.

Ms. Williams began the meeting by welcoming the participants and briefly outlining the activities planned for that day. She indicated the sheet that had been sent to participants describing the status of the protocols (see Appendix A) and said the listing would serve as the group's agenda. She noted that this meeting represents a full year's effort by the group to help DOE develop its protocols, and thanked participants for their work in this area. She noted draft materials had been distributed electronically in advance of the meeting for participants to review; discussion then focused on specific protocols. Ms. Williams added that written and verbal comments on specific protocols had been collected by the DOE Writing Group and were reflected in the comment response documents that were sent out; she said that the group would not go through the matrices comment by comment, however.

*Shipment Prenotification*

Ms. Williams noted the main change in this protocol had been under the spent fuel and high-level waste section; here, language had been added to state that DOE intended to notify state and tribal officials so that they are informed at least seven days in advance of

the shipment taking place. Mr. Niles noted that other high-level shipments like cesium capsules may not be included in this section. Mr. Guidice responded that the Writing Group has an ongoing assignment to capture all significant commodity flows that are expected; and that some of this information is not complete in some cases. During the final “polishing” of these drafts, he said, DOE hopes to address all significant material types. Ms. Williams asked whether all the final protocols would reflect this effort. Mr. Guidice responded the major material types for cleanup were guiding development for all the protocols and the final protocols would reflect the change. Mr. Naples asked whether the entire package of final drafts would be available for review in time for the next TEC/WG meeting, and Mr. Guidice responded they would be. He cautioned that the development schedule was an ambitious one, however. Ms. Williams stated current plans were to have all drafts to the topic group for review by April, and that the July meeting would focus on examining all the protocols together as a total package.

One commenter noted “radioactive shipments” in the introduction, line 2, should read “radioactive materials.” Ms. Williams referred to the key issues discussion portion of the draft and noted the comment that all transuranic (TRU) waste shipments should be treated like WIPP shipments had been made for all the protocols. Participants agreed and emphasized their desire to see all TRU waste shipments treated equally, not to have shipments to WIPP handled in one manner and intersite shipments another. Ms. Williams replied that DOE understood the comments, but noted several different programs had ownership of the waste at various locations and a Department-wide policy decision had not been made at this time. She stated DOE hoped to have this issue resolved by the time of the next meeting in July 2000. Ms. Sattler asked whether this issue was being given appropriate priority by the Department, given the potential for imminent shipments of this type. Ms. Williams replied the Carlsbad Area Office owns the National TRU Program, but cannot make policy on its own because other programs are affected too. Mr. Ross suggested this protocol (and all the others affecting TRU waste shipments) at least contain a statement that even if the WIPP protocols are not followed, there will be a dialogue with affected stakeholders as the WIPP program has done. This would be better than simply stating “TBD” under other TRU shipments, he said.

After some discussion, participants commented that dual-placarded shipments where one is a radioactive placard should have prenotification procedures as well. Discussion focused on some comments submitted asking for notification in advance of the seven-day requirement in the regulations. Mr. Ross asked why the proposed new language stated states would be “informed” rather than “notified;” Mr. English responded “informed was used because “notified” is tied in the regulations to the specific seven-day notice, not any notice DOE may try to give before that time. Discussion then ensued about potential problems with states and appropriate state offices actually receiving notice too late to effectively prepare, even though the notifications were sent as the regulations required. Dennis Claussen (DOE/Richland) noted that such had been the case with a shipment of spent fuel, when notifications had been properly sent but not recognized by the state.

Another participant asked what was being done to resolve the issue of whether electronic or other non-mail communications could be effectively used. Mr. Swedberg noted that

there are safeguards concerns about advance notifications, and this would likely complicate notification procedures using email. Ms. Williams noted this issue had arisen in previous sessions, and asked Mr. Alcock to follow up with his contacts at NRC to determine whether email could be used. Ms. Sattler asked whether it would be feasible for DOE to either commit that the appropriate agency will actually receive notification within seven days, or that DOE will follow a ten-plus day policy for sending such information. She noted the requirements call for “at least” seven days’ notice, therefore a DOE policy requiring ten days’ notice would be consistent with the regulations. Ms. Williams responded DOE’s General Counsel has had objections about committing to notifications beyond that required in the regulations, that confusion about which notices should come out and when might hamper DOE’s ability to follow its requirements. She said that DOE recognizes the issue, however, and agreed to take this issue back to the Writing Group. Ms. Sattler stated that DOE policy went beyond requirements in several areas, notably notification of tribes, and objections in this area might not be consistent with policy determinations in other areas.

Ms. Williams also asked Stephanie Martz of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) if she had any comments on the notification issue. Ms. Martz replied that NRC has had an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking out for comment for some time that asked for input on how NRC ought to provide notifications for tribes; any comment on how this might be done, particularly with regard to the means of communication, would be very much appreciated.

#### *Projected Shipment Planning Information*

Ms. Williams indicated the main changes to this draft were the addition of “high-volume shipments” of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste (LLW and MLLW), and the use by DOE programs of the Prospective Shipments Module (PSM) for providing projected shipment planning information after the applicable NEPA process is completed. She then handed out copies of the latest PSM prototype for participants’ further information.

Mr. Niles stated his objection to the protocol’s use of the word “may” in stating how DOE programs are to provide information under the PSM. NTP ought to be able to issue in DOE Orders or other guidance that programs “will” or “shall” provide such information to the PSM. Mr. Niles added if participation in the PSM was voluntary, there would always be the question of “What is missing?” Ms. Williams noted the comment, and stated DOE is trying not to be overly prescriptive in its development of the protocols, which has essentially been a consensus process. Other programs may wish to communicate such information by other means, she said. Discussion then focused on the key issues that had been developed from past comments.

Ms. Williams noted the first key issue was that stakeholders had requested a three-year forecast for prospective shipments information. She added that given planning and scheduling uncertainties within DOE, this was going to be a real problem for the Department and would continue to be. DOE will continue to work with its stakeholders to

provide them the information they need and with sufficient lead time to effectively plan for shipments.

She noted that having scheduled updates for advance information had generated a lot of discussion, and indicated the prototype PSM that had been handed out. She noted this version was a one-year forecast, and would be updated quarterly.

Mr. Niles suggested that in this protocol, as with others, DOE should try to avoid using statements like “to be determined” or “on a case-by-case basis,” or the whole point of bringing greater consistency could be lost. If the PSM is to be updated on a quarterly basis, he said, then the protocol should say so, preferably using a quarterly update as a minimum. Mr. Guidice noted the importance of doing so, but added there were many different materials and programs involved, and defining a one-size-fits-all approach will be very difficult. Mr. English added that as a member of the Writing Group, he and his colleagues have been working more on defining a process for how DOE will conduct its activities and work with its stakeholders, rather than developing checklists or other prescriptive criteria.

Specific discussions next focused on the draft PSM itself. Ms. Williams noted in response to comments on earlier versions, DOE had added a point-of-contact for further information regarding each shipping campaign. In the listing, the mode is assumed to be by truck unless rail is stated. Barge and air shipments are not included, she said. More information was requested on destination points, she said, and also on specific routes to be used. DOE is not planning on specifying planned routes in the PSM, she said; instead, a listing of states through which shipments are likely has been developed.

Ms. Sattler asked how the different campaigns had been ordered in the PSM, and whether campaigns could be ordered according to commodity, frequency, numbers of shipments or other factors. Ms. Williams replied she would find out and provide that information to the group. Mr. Ross asked whether the campaigns could be ordered by quarter to indicate what activity is likely during a given three-month period. Ms. Williams responded that earlier versions has attempted to provide such information, but given scheduling uncertainties it may not be possible to get as specific at the current time. Mr. Bechtel asked whether the prototype included all shipments being contemplated for the coming year; Ms. Williams responded that some shipments such as those of LLW to the Nevada Test Site are beginning to show up but not all LLW shipment are required to be included.

Considerable discussion focused on how the Writing Group and DOE was defining “high-volume shipments” of LLW and MLLW, because depending on how the term is defined, a particular campaign may or may not be covered by the projected shipment planning information protocol. Ms. Williams stated the proposed criteria (5 or more truckloads per week for six months or more, or 60 railcars or more a month for six or more months) had been suggested as one way to provide a meaningful demarcation; the intent was to define a reasonable level of activity rather than to capture specific ongoing or planned campaigns. Messrs. Ross and Niles both suggested the “bar” put forward in these criteria may be too high; under these definitions, campaigns with less than 120

truckloads or 360 railcars over the period might fall below the defining criteria, but would almost certainly be campaigns stakeholders would want to know more about. They suggested substantially lowering both numbers and frequencies that define “high-volume” shipments, and Ms. Williams agreed to communicate this to the Writing Group, particularly lowering the time to three months.

### *Routing*

Ms. Williams noted the routing protocol has been the most difficult one to develop because of its importance and impact on the other protocols. She briefly reviewed the comments resulting from the last meeting in Philadelphia and stated the current draft attempted to reflect those comments in a manner that was both responsive to stakeholders’ concerns and practical from the standpoint of implementation by programs. She reiterated the routing protocol was not intended to supplant any agreements that may have already been made between DOE and other entities regarding routing; moreover, the protocol is intended to establish a process, not a prescriptive approach. Final modifications to this protocol may be needed when all the protocols are finalized, or when its practical application in the future indicates changes may be needed.

Mr. Ross noted there was no discussion about seagoing routing of vessels; Ms. Williams responded that such was the case because seagoing shipments would be handled according to their individual circumstances and requirements. Mr. Ross asked whether the word “appropriate” could be replaced with “preferred” in the discussion about routing for highway shipments; Mr. Swedberg noted that “preferred” was the regulatory term used for highway route controlled quantity shipments of radioactive material which would most likely include highway shipments of spent nuclear fuel (49 CFR 397), and Mr. Conroy added that “appropriate” was chosen precisely to include all shipments covered by the protocol, not just spent fuel or high-level waste. One commenter noted the reference to the routing program INTERLINE should be taken out of the highway routing section as that program identifies routes for rail.

Considerable discussion focused on Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) shipments to be managed by the RW program. Several commenters expressed their dissatisfaction about language they saw as delegating responsibility for routing decisions to a private contractor. Mr. Carlson noted the draft Request for Proposals under which such contracting was being contemplated would in essence direct the contractor to run the routing codes, while DOE would work together with states, tribes and local governments to determine the appropriate routes; given this language, he said, it is difficult to see what specific provisions the commenters found objectionable. He agreed to provide the salient portions of the draft RFP to participants. Commenters suggested the protocol ought to state that ultimate responsibility for routing will remain with DOE, and DOE will commit to a process of working with affected parties to identify routes that will be used.

Under the WIPP routing section, one commenter suggested the statement about states and tribes being able to designate routes should also be explicitly mentioned in the spent fuel section. Other TRU-related comments mainly focused on the issue of intersite TRU



shipments being treated like WIPP shipments that had taken place in earlier protocols discussions (see above).

Most of the remaining discussion focused on routing for LLW and MLLW. Mr. Swedberg noted the routing language basically parroted that in the routing regulations (49 CFR 397), except that it omitted the words “for which placarding is required.” He asked what practical difference this would make; he opined that most LSA shipments would be placarded anyway, if transported as exclusive use LSA. Mr. Ross suggested that one point of the protocol should be to look beyond the basic regulatory requirements; other guidance that has been developed that could also help determine how DOE plans its shipments. He specifically indicated that guidance promulgated by the FMCSA for non-radioactive hazardous materials shipments was designed to help prevent incidents, and he suggested that DOE examine this guidance for potential improvements to the protocol.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Ross added the protocol should also recognize the “funneling” effect that takes place when shipments from different sites are sent to a limited number of disposal sites, usually in the West.

Mr. Bechtel stated he liked seeing the new language added under the LLW/MLLW section; it clarifies what carriers should do. However, given the large numbers of shipments of LLW/MLLW that are planned, DOE has to remain proactive and not simply hand off responsibilities to a carrier. The Department has been improving its record of trying to be sensitive to state, tribal and local concerns, he said; a contractor might try to avoid such interactions. For specific campaigns, a LLW routing plan should serve as a basis for dialogue, he said. Finally, Mr. Bechtel noted that while there is ample discussion about what carriers ought to do and when, there is no clear indication how DOE plans to make sure such procedures are implemented. This needs to be clearly spelled out for all the protocols, he said. Other participants agreed.

Mr. Paull outlined one concern that his constituents (northeastern states) have had with regard to the LLW/MLLW issue. If DOE and its stakeholders continue to focus on LLW shipments and extra-regulatory requirements similar to those for spent fuel, he said, then the emphasis may be lost where it is most needed—on shipments of spent fuel and high-level waste. Opponents of spent fuel transportation might also use such discussions as a basis to assert that preparations for spent fuel transport are not adequate, he said, and the northeastern states do not share that view. Ms. Sattler agreed that while LLW shipments are important, the midwestern states are most concerned with spent fuel shipments. Mr. Ross noted the concerns, but observed that LLW shipments are moving now, in large numbers, through the western states and that right now those shipments have priority in that region. Mr. Paull reiterated his states would oppose a “ratcheting up” of requirements for high-level waste shipments, and that in any case the protocols should not exhaustively outline what participants are going to do in every possible circumstance.

Ms. Williams asked participants if the volumes of LLW being shipped should have a bearing on their routing; i.e., whether higher-frequency shipments would dictate a

---

<sup>1</sup> The document, Hazardous Materials Incident Prevention Manual: Routing and Scheduling Policy, was promulgated by FMCSA and can be found at [www.fmcsa.dot.gov/factsfigs/accidenthm/policy.htm](http://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/factsfigs/accidenthm/policy.htm)

different route. Several participants agreed that it could, depending on the circumstances. Others suggested that routing for this category of material would be difficult enough without breaking it down further into subclassifications based on numbers and frequency; the overall goal should be to improve safety. Ms. Dixon noted that in her experience as a local official, if even one truck with placards is spotted along a route it becomes news, so some kind of designations may be needed no matter how few the shipments are to avoid undue surprise.

One participant noted that references to the IAEA should be added to the ICAO citation in the last paragraph of the LLW/MLLW Routing section and since the introduction paragraph states that routing of air shipments is not addressed in this document, the sentence referencing the applicable regulations that would be used for air shipments be removed for consistency purposes.

Under the rail routing section, one commenter asked whether the use of the term “higher-grade track” should be replaced with “higher-class track.” Mr. Fronczak noted that both terms might be superfluous because of the definition of “key routes” in AAR Circular OT-55-B, which will soon be updated. He suggested modifying Paragraph III.A.1. a.(3) as follows: “use of ‘key routes’ as defined in Association of American Railroads Circular OT-55.” Another commenter noted the reference to the HIGHWAY code should be eliminated from this section, and the references to the NWPA RFP should be consistent with the discussion about highway shipments for the same material stream (see above).

Participants next discussed the issue of rail shipments for TRU waste, referencing the comments already made on these materials in the other protocols (see above). Ms. Williams noted that DOE/CAO was examining the Rail Companion to the WIPP Program Implementation Guide that the TEC/WG Rail Topic Group had developed to determine what might occur if intersite shipments of TRU waste were done via rail. Stanley Paytiamo of the Acoma Pueblo noted if rail shipments to WIPP were being contemplated, that could have a significant impact on his pueblo’s emergency and environmental planning.

Ms. Williams asked that written comments on the routing protocol be sent to DOE by March 10 so that the final draft can be developed. There being no further comments on the routing protocol, the group then adjourned for lunch and reconvened at approximately 1:00 p.m.

### *Emergency Notification*

Ms. Williams noted this was the first time the group had seen either the emergency notification or the emergency response protocols; she asked that written comments on either be submitted to DOE by March 10 so that the Writing Group can incorporate them into the next iteration.

Ms. Eidelman mentioned there were several issues in this protocol and the one covering emergency response that were of concern to ECA communities. No mention is made in

either protocol about notification or response from the standpoint of local governments, which is a matter of some concern since local governments would be expected to be the first responders on scene and typically would have incident command. The protocols need to spell out how local governments would be involved and what their roles are, she said. Ms. Hanlon stated there were several issues the Writing Group had considered in developing the draft. It might be impractical to attempt to provide emergency notifications to local governments along an entire route; this raises related issues about what communities would do with the information and whether this kind of notification is a Federal responsibility or one better exercised by the states. As a practical matter, Ms. Hanlon agreed the first responders would most likely be local officials, such as a law enforcement officer on the scene; if that happened then notifications would proceed through that jurisdiction's chain of command as it would for any emergency. Ms. Eidelman reiterated ECA's position that regarding incidents involving DOE materials, it is DOE's responsibility to notify local governments. Mr. Ross suggested the protocol should add clarifying language to show how local governments would be involved in the event of an emergency. Ms. Threatt added that notifications for jurisdictions along a route where an event happens would be a sizeable task for her state, which has 46 counties along potential routes; she opined that it would be extremely difficult for DOE to do that on its own even if it were appropriate. Ms. Williams stated the next iteration of both protocols would have language added to it to reflect this concern.

Mr. Fronczak asked how the criteria for identifying situations were compiled; they should mirror the applicable regulations, he said. Ms. Hanlon replied the criteria were derived from several documents, including internal DOE Orders governing emergency response. It should be noted, she added, the protocol spells out what DOE is going to do in a given situation; carriers have their own requirements to follow in regulations. Several commenters raised questions about listed "triggering" events that might raise some confusion if misinterpreted, such as "major" injuries or routes being closed "for one hour or more." As a practical matter, they said, any injuries may be of interest to affected jurisdictions, and road closures by their nature never last less than one hour; in any event, DOE should not wait for a closure to exceed an hour before making calls. The protocol should generally provide that when circumstances are unclear, the notifications should be made, they said. Mr. English noted the "Application of Criteria" section was intended to state how DOE will make such determinations; participants suggested the language be clarified to more clearly state this.

Mr. Niles indicated that one element that was not addressed in the protocol was whether there would be any time requirements by which DOE would have to make notifications. For certain types of incidents, such as nuclear power plant incidents, there are requirements that specific notifications must be made within 15 or 30 minutes, depending on the severity of the incident. Mr. Niles said he wasn't ready to suggest a specific time limit, but at the very least wanted language included that would prompt notifications to begin as soon as possible. After some discussion, it was agreed that the Writing Group would review the need for some requirement or delineation of time by which DOE should make such notifications.



Mr. Niles asked whether adjacent states or tribes would be notified in the event of an emergency. Ms. Hanlon responded the section describing RCO activities could be changed to explicitly state this as an example of other notifications that could be made. Under the descriptions of types of information to be provided, participants suggested it be made clear information should be exchanged as it becomes available; put another way, DOE should not wait for every piece of information to be complete before letting people know something is going on. Finally, said commenters, the listing should also include what response activities are currently underway. In the final section entitled “Non-Emergency Events,” DOE should provide examples of what such events might include, like out-of-service events or civil protests.

### *Emergency Response*

For the emergency response protocol, Ms. Eidelman reiterated the concerns raised in the emergency notification protocol discussion (see above). One commenter asked whether barge shipments were addressed in this protocol; Mr. Guidice replied that language regarding barge shipments would be added in the final “polishing” stage. Ms. Sattler added that her group may have extensive comments based on the emergency notification protocol’s definition of incidents. She also suggested the extensive discussion of WIPP CMR procedures might be more appropriately placed in a footnote or other reference, as it states only one procedure for one program. Ms. Threatt asked whether the Incident Command System (ICS) was used extensively by tribes, and what differences in this protocol might result if they do not. Participants noted this protocol was the only one developed that goes beyond stating what DOE would do and describes activities of other jurisdictions. If those activities are not clearly defined, said Ms. Threatt, there could be problems later on.

Ms. Sattler also suggested the different sections be checked for consistent use of verb tense. Mr. Niles noted that a public information protocol template had been developed by the Communications Topic Group; Ms. Hanlon responded the Writing Group will examine the template and the draft Public Information protocol will reflect it.

### *Concluding Discussions*

Following discussions on the specific protocols above, a participant asked what process DOE was planning to use to implement the protocols after they are finalized. Mr. Guidice said three options were being considered: (1) implementing the protocols through the existing DOE Order process; (2) issuing a Secretarial policy or letter, which would be faster and less rigorous from an implementation standpoint (easier to implement); or (3) developing an acquisition letter requiring procurement officials to incorporate the requirements into contracts. By the next Senior Executive Transportation Forum meeting, said Mr. Guidice, DOE hopes to have a recommended approach. Messrs. Niles and Paull complimented the Writing Group on the solid work they have accomplished on the protocols thus far.

One participant asked if comments on protocols submitted in the first and second rounds of review could be differentiated somehow to show the order of submittal. Ms. Williams agreed that future versions of the comment matrices would show this. Mr. Fronczak asked that all the protocols be scanned to replace “driver” with “crew” in referring to rail shipments, as trains do not have “drivers.”

Ms. Williams noted the group would soon be receiving a number of new drafts, including protocols on inspection, recovery and cleanup, emergency planning, public information, security and transportation planning. The Writing Group is currently working on four drafts for which comments have been submitted, and for which second drafts should soon be available: transportation operational contingencies, safe parking, carrier/driver requirements and tracking. The tentative schedule is for DOE to deliver first drafts to the topic group members by April 2000, with an eye toward having all the drafts essentially complete by the next TEC/WG meeting in July 2000. Mr. Naples noted how productive the face-to-face session had been, and suggested DOE consider scheduling another such meeting before the July meeting if the production schedule is met. Several participants agreed. Ms. Williams noted the suggestions and said DOE would look into the feasibility of doing so. At the very least, she said, the group should plan for a conference call in the April timeframe.

There being no further comments, the session adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m. Mr. Mackie presented several slides at the topic group wrap-up session the following morning; they are attached as Appendix B.

**Action Items:**

- Comments on the routing, emergency notification and emergency response protocols should be provided to DOE (Mona Williams) by March 10.
- Ms. Williams will explore the potential for holding another face-to-face meeting in the May timeframe.
- Ms. Williams will determine whether the PSM can group campaigns by frequency, numbers, or commodities and will report back to the group.
- Mr. Alcock will coordinate with NRC the issue of using electronic notification of jurisdictions needing advance information and will report back to the topic group.
- Mr. Carlson will obtain language from the RW RFP related to routing and provide it to the topic group.
- Future versions of protocols will be provided in .pdf format to ensure consistency in formatting and numbering.
- DOE will provide the above-specified drafts to the group for initial review in April.
- Mr. Dietz will examine whether tribes use the ICS system and will report back to the topic group

**APPENDIX A:TRANSPORTATION PROTOCOL TOPICS--STATUS**

<b><u>Original List</u></b>	<b><u>Current Topics</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
Pre-notification	Shipment Prenotification	Revised version approved by Steering Committee on 12/16 for 2 <sup>nd</sup> round of internal review
	Projected Shipment Planning Information	Revised version approved by Steering Committee on 12/16 for 2 <sup>nd</sup> round of internal review
Routing	Routing	Revised version in review by Steering Committee
Adverse Weather and Road Conditions	Transportation Operational Contingencies	In review by TEC/WG Topic Group, discussed on 12/16 TEC/WG Topic Group conf. call.
Safe Parking/Safe Haven	Safe Parking	In review by TEC/WG Topic Group, discussed on 12/16 TEC/WG Topic Group conf. call.
Carrier/Driver Requirements	Carrier/Driver Requirements	In review by TEC/WG Topic Group, discussed on 12/16 TEC/WG Topic Group conf. call.
Tracking	Tracking	In review by TEC/WG Topic Group, discussed on 12/16 TEC/WG Topic Group conf. call.
Emergency Notifications	Emergency Notification	Approved by Steering Committee on 12/16 for internal review
Emergency Response	Emergency Response	Approved by Steering Committee on 12/16 for internal review
Emergency Planning	Emergency Planning	Currently in preparation
Inspections	Inspections	Currently in preparation
Post-Shipment	-----	Deleted; covered by inspections.
Security	Security	To be developed
Remediation	Recovery & Clean-up	Re-titled, currently in preparation
Crisis Communications	-----	To be incorporated into the Emergency Response protocol.
Training	-----	To be incorporated into the Emergency Planning protocol.
Equipment	-----	To be incorporated into the Emergency Planning protocol.
Public Information	Public Information	To be developed
-----	Transportation Planning	To be developed

**APPENDIX B:****TEC/WG SUMMARY SESSION SLIDES FROM PROTOCOLS GROUP  
(Text Appears in Outline Format)**

DOE Transportation Protocols Topic Group  
*Discussions and Findings*  
*February 2000 Meeting*

*General Timeline, Process*

- 5 Protocols Reviewed; 2 for Round 1, 3 for Round 2
- Submitting Comments March 10
- Potential 4 Round 2 Review in April
- Potential 6 Round 1 Review in April
- May Need A Spring Face-to-Face Review Meeting to Meet Review/Release Goals

*Shipment Prenotification*

- Treat All TRU Shipments Like WIPP
- Need for 7+ Days' Receipt of Information
- Potential for Alternate Means of Communication (Non-Snail Mail)

*Shipment Planning Information*

- PSM Principal Mechanism
  - Recommend Annual PSM with Quarterly Rolling Updates
- Definitions of “High Volume” LLW/MLLW Campaigns an Issue
  - Setting the “Bar” for Defining Numbers and Duration for Truck and For Rail

*Routing*

- Written Comments Due March 10
- LLW the Big Issue/Most Discussion
  - Suggestions for Looking at Non-RAM Hazmat Planning Guidance
  - Regional Difference of Opinion/Perspective Exists for LLW Planning

*Emergency Notification*

- Written Comments by March 10
- Acknowledgement of Role of Local Communities
- When in Doubt, Make the Call
- Definition of Non-Emergency (Off-Normal) Event

*Emergency Response*

- Comments Due on March 10
- Criteria Addresses Actions Taken by Response Jurisdictions, Not Just DOE (Unique)
- Local Government Role an Issue Here Too
- Public Affairs Issues Being Coordinated with Public Information Protocol (and Communication Topic Group)

*Action Items*

- Alternate Means of Communication; Coordinating with NRC
- OCRWM RFP/Privatization and Roles in Routing Decisions
- Release Drafts in PDF Format
- Extent to Which Tribes Use Unified Command Structure Is Being Explored